

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,908	11/07/2000	Osamu Niwa	A33711 PCT U	5718
21003	7590 02/10/2004		EXAMINER .	
BAKER & BOTTS			HON, SOW FUN	
	ELLER PLAZA L. NY 10112		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
1.2,, 1011	·, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		1772	
			DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary	09/674,908	NIWA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
The MAIL INC DATE of this communication and	Sow-Fun Hon	the correspondence as	Idross				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 10) days will be considered timel S from the mailing date of this c DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ly. ommunication.				
Status							
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/26/2003. This action is FINAL. This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6 is/are withdrawn fro 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	epted or b)⊡ objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyance	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	FR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents.	s have been received. s have been received in App ity documents have been re i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/26/03.	Paper No(s)/N	nmary (PTO-413) //ail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO	O-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Rejections Withdrawn

- 1. The 35 U.S. C. 112, 2nd paragraph rejection of claims 3-4 in the action mailed 06/02/03 has been withdrawn due to Applicant's affirmation in the response filed 11/26/03 of the broad interpretation of the claims.
- 2. The 35 U.S. C. 102(b) and 103(a) rejections of claims 1-5 in the action mailed 06/02/03 has been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment in the response filed 11/26/03.

New Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gasse et al. as evidenced by Khanna et al. (US 6,040,392).

Gasse et al. teaches a film composed of a polyamide resin layer (A), a polyamide resin layer blend (B) of 10-60 weight % of amorphous polyamide resin and 40-90 weight % of aliphatic polyamide resin, an adhesive layer (D) (bonding layer) and a seal layer (C) (heat sealing layer) (abstract). A preferred five-layer structure is A/D/B/D/C, wherein D is a polyolefin layer (bonding layer of polyethylene or polypropylene). Total film thickness is 15 to 400 μm (column 2, lines 10-55) which encompasses the claimed range of 15 to 35 μm.

Application/Control Number: 09/674,908

Art Unit: 1772

The recitation "for forming a vapor deposited balloon" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). In the instant case, due to the optional language of intended use, the film can be used for forming other articles.

Gasse et al. teaches that prior art film prepared from polyamide blends are biaxially stretched on grounds of strength, but can then no longer be thermoformed (column 1, lines 10-40). However, when thermoforming is not used, strength from biaxial stretching does not have to be sacrificed. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have biaxially stretched the film in the absence of the need to use thermoforming to further process the film in order to strengthen it.

Even though product by process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)*. In the instant case, it does not matter what machines are being used to produce the presently claimed biaxially oriented film.

Application/Control Number: 09/674,908

Art Unit: 1772

In specifying that the blend comprises 10-60 weight % of amorphous polyamide resin as opposed to the remaining 40-90 weight % of aliphatic polyamide resin (abstract), Gasse et al. is in essence teaching that the remaining 40-90 weight % of aliphatic polyamide resin is crystalline. This is reinforced by Gasse et al. teaching that polyamide 6 is dinstinctly more crystalline than a blend containing amorphous polyamide (column 1, lines 30-45). Polyamide 6 is synonymous with nylon 6, as evidenced by Khanna et al.

Khanna et al. uses the terms "nylon polymers" and "polyamides" interchangeably (column 1, lines 20-30), thus teaching that nylon 6 is synonymous with polyamide 6. Khanna et al. also teaches that the nylon (polyamide) blend provides reduced curl when coextruded with a layer of polyolefin (olefin polymer) (column 1, lines 10-20).

5. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gasse et al. as evidenced by Khanna et al. as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Noguchi (EP 0 792 741).

Gasse et al. has been discussed above, and teaches a film which comprises a five-layer structure composed of a polyamide resin layer, a polyolefin layer, a polyamide resin layer, an adhesive resin layer and a seal layer, wherein the polyamide resin layers comprise about 70-90 wt % of crystalline nylon (polyamide 6) and about 30-5 wt % of amorphous nylon (polyamide), as evidenced by Khanna et al.

In addition, Gasse et al. teaches that the film based on polyamide and polyolefins, has good heat sealability (column 1, lines 55-65), and that the two polyamide layers are required to give elevated mechanical strength, specifically puncture resistance (column 5, lines 45-55).

Application/Control Number: 09/674,908

Art Unit: 1772

Gasse et al., however, fails to teach a metal deposited layer formed on the other side, wherein the metal deposited layer is formed on the surface of the outermost polyamide resin layer of the film.

Noguchi teaches a multilayer film used for balloons (column 1, lines 10-15) which comprises a metal deposited layer 14 (column 4, lines 1-10) formed on the surface of the outermost polyamide (nylon) base film layer 11 (column 3, lines 50-55). The deposited metal layer provides a surface for images to be printed on (column 1, lines 35-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the surface of the outermost polyamide resin layer in the multilayer film of Gasse et al. with a metal deposited layer as taught by Noguchi in order to form a balloon decorated with images. The multilayer film of Gasse et al. has good heat sealability ('262, column 1, lines 55-65), and the combination of the two polyamide layers gives elevated mechanical strength, specifically puncture resistance ('262, column 5, lines 45-55) which is important for a balloon article.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1772

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sow-Fun Hon whose telephone number is (571)272-1492. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached at (571)272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sow-Fun Hon

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER